

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Case Reports in Surgery</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJCRS_108339</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Double rarity right Bochdalek's hernia with intrathoracic kidney :case report</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Case study</b>

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>We fully appreciate the effort made by colleagues to accomplish this report. The topic itself is of great importance. Having professed my general enthusiasm for the topic and its importance, I have some concerns that I feel are tractable but require substantive effort. Interestingly to have such a report and absolutely, it represented one of the rare pathologies that should be considered. The authors have provided valuable insights into the diagnostic and therapeutic challenges posed by this unique case.</p> <p>My comments here are concerned solely with the re-organization of the manuscript. Consideration of these points will, I believe, lead to an improved report that better illustrates the key concepts and conclusions.</p> <p><u>The introduction</u> provides a clear overview of the topic, however, there are a few improvements that could be made:</p> <p>a; the introduction mentions that Bochdalek hernias are rare and right-sided defects are uncommon but doesn't provide any statistics to quantify this rarity. Adding some specific data or references would enhance the introduction.</p> <p>b ; It's important to explain why the case described is exceptional and why this specific case merits attention. What are the broader implications of understanding and treating such a case?</p> <p>c; the introduction mentions the challenge of treatment with both operative and non-operative options. It could benefit from briefly explaining what these options are and why the choice of a conservative strategy was made for this particular patient.</p> <p>d ; the statement about nonoperative treatment being documented in a few patients should be backed up with references. This strengthens the credibility of the article and allows readers to explore these cases further.</p> <p>e ; grammar and Syntax: There are a few minor grammatical issues and awkward phrases in the text. For instance, "Intrathoracic right kidney associated with Bochdalek hernia is extremely rare" could be rephrased for better flow.</p> <p>In summary, the introduction provides a good starting point for the article, but some minor revisions and additions could enhance its clarity and the reader's understanding of the significance of the case. Additionally, citing sources for claims made in the introduction would be beneficial</p> <p><u>Patient Presentation:</u> The section effectively presents the patient's age, medical history, and initial symptoms, providing a clear picture of their background. However, there are a few areas that could be improved:</p> <p>a ; while mentioning the patient's age, diabetes, hypertension, and lack of surgical history is relevant, it might be beneficial to provide a brief explanation of why these factors are important in the context of the case. For instance, how might these factors influence the chosen treatment strategy?</p> <p>b ; the description of the patient's presentation is clear, but it could be more structured. It might be helpful to have a bulleted list of the patient's key symptoms and physical findings for quick reference.</p> <p>c ; the mention of the patient's inflammatory syndrome and creatinine levels is important, but it would be helpful to clarify what "correct renal function" means in this context, as it might vary from reader to reader.</p> <p>d ; the decision not to operate is a crucial aspect of the case. It's explained briefly but could benefit from more context. Why was this decision made, and what were the factors considered in making this choice? This could provide valuable insights into the clinical</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

	<p>decision-making process. e ; it's good to know that the patient was reviewed 6 months later with no complaints, but a bit more information on the follow-up process, any additional tests or considerations, and the patient's overall well-being would add depth to the case presentation. f ; consider using bullet points or subsections to break down the information in a more structured manner, making it easier for the reader to follow the patient's case.</p> <p>Overall, this section provides essential information about the patient's presentation and initial diagnosis, but it could be enhanced by providing more context around the treatment decision and the follow-up process. Additionally, a bit more structure and formatting could improve readability.</p> <p><b>Discussion:</b> a; the text effectively presents the clinical characteristics of Bochdalek hernias, their frequency, and their typical presentation. To enhance clarity, consider using bullet points or subheadings to segment this information, making it more reader-friendly. b ; the section mentions that diaphragm abnormalities cannot be diagnosed using chest radiography and recommend using CT or MRI. This is important information but could be expanded upon. Include a brief explanation of why these imaging techniques are superior in diagnosing Bochdalek hernias. c ; the text discusses the surgical approach for treating Bochdalek hernias. However, it might be valuable to clarify when surgery is typically recommended (e.g., symptomatic cases, specific size of the defect, or other criteria) and why surgery is the preferred method in most cases. d ; the section mentions watchful waiting as a suitable strategy in selected cases, especially in asymptomatic patients or those with advanced age and multiple diseases. It's crucial to specify the criteria for selecting this approach and discuss the potential benefits and risks associated with it. e ; the paragraph about the ectopic kidney treatment options is informative, but it might be helpful to explain how the choice is made between mobilizing the kidney into the abdomen or reducing other contents without touching the kidney. Provide some insights into the factors that influence this decision. f ; the information about long-term follow-up and the need for regular monitoring is important. However, it might be beneficial to specify the frequency and nature of follow-up visits for patients with these conditions. g; the section emphasizes the need for individualized, multidisciplinary management but doesn't engage in specific considerations or what a multidisciplinary approach entails. It would be helpful to briefly discuss what this approach might involve.</p> <p>In conclusion, the discussion section provides valuable information about Bochdalek hernias, their diagnosis, treatment options, and the rare occurrence of an intrathoracic right renal ectopia. Adding more context to some of the points and expanding on the rationale behind certain treatment decisions would enhance the reader's understanding. The conclusion could be slightly more detailed to encapsulate the significance of the presented case.</p> <p><b>The conclusion</b> is concise and summarizes the key points discussed in the article. However, it could be expanded slightly to encapsulate the primary findings and implications of the presented case, making it more impactful.</p> <p>The article needs some proofreading for grammar, punctuation, and sentence structure.</p>	
--	---	--

**Review Form 1.7**

<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Mohammed Joudi Aboud</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>The Maternity and Child Teaching Hospital, Iraq</b>